

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 388 091

FL 023 344

AUTHOR Ngan, Heltan; Kong, Judy
TITLE A Theoretical Framework for Teaching Chinese-English/English-Chinese Translation to Tertiary Students: The Use of "Foreign Translation Theories" for "Domestic" Purposes through S.E.A.S.
PUB DATE 95
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Conference of the Institute of Language in Education (December 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Chinese; Classroom Techniques; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Instructional Materials; Linguistic Theory; Models; Second Language Instruction; Textbook Content; *Theory Practice Relationship; *Translation

ABSTRACT

The approach taken commonly in instructional materials designed for teaching translation at the college level is examined, and an alternative is proposed. The approach under examination is the use of western translation theories to teach translation between Chinese and English, often incorporating examples from other, unfamiliar languages. It is argued that the theories and principles presented to students are not always relevant to Chinese. The alternative approach proposed here (S.E.A.S., or selection/elucidation/adaptation/supplementation) addresses the way in which translation theories are presented to students. Four elements of presentation are seen as essential: (1) careful selection of basic concepts of translation (translatability on phonological, lexical, linguistic, and cultural levels, and the nature and types of translation); (2) elucidation of each theory, using examples in Chinese and English; (3) adaptation of theories to make them applicable to translation between Chinese and English; and (4) supplementation of theories to address considerations unique to Chinese. Each of these elements is illustrated with examples from western translation theory. Contains 20 references. (MSE)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

A Theoretical Framework for Teaching Chinese-English/English-Chinese Translation to Tertiary Students: the Use of 'Foreign Translation Theories' for 'Domestic' Purposes through S.E.A.S.

Heltan NGAN and Judy KONG
Hong Kong Polytechnic University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ngan Heltan
Judy Kong

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

☐ Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Introduction

At present, the subject of translation between Chinese and English is not taught to secondary students of Hong Kong. Students who are interested in this area could only pursue the study of this subject after they enrol in tertiary institutions.

The translation courses of tertiary institutions emphasize both the theoretical and practical aspects. The latter involves actual translation practices between Chinese and English, the two languages which Hong Kong students have begun to learn since childhood, covering a wide range of areas such as business, legal, documentary, scientific and literary writings. As for the former, apart from embracing views advocated by Chinese translators, it also covers theories and principles propounded by western theorists, the most notable being J.C. Catford, E. Nida, P. Newmark. Yet in reading the works of these theorists, Hong Kong students are confronted with one great problem --- they are unable to fully understand the examples given, because these often involve the use of English which they do know and other languages which they do not, such as French, German, Greek.

Moreover, it must be noted that these theories and principles, chiefly formulated for translation between European languages against their own specific backgrounds, are not geared towards translation between Chinese and English. There are in fact, far more differences between these two languages at different levels. These theories and principles, though useful, are not always relevant when they are applied to translation between Chinese and English. Thus in introducing them to tertiary students who are initiated into this subject, a special methodology has to be devised and adopted.

In this paper, the applicability of the oft-quoted foreign theories and principles will be critically examined, and a theoretical framework for teaching translation between Chinese and English to tertiary students, S.E.A.S., i.e. selection, elucidation, adaptation, and supplementation, will be put forward.

Selection

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In the light of the fact that this is the students' first encounter with the subject of translation, they must be

ED 388 091

FL023344

familiarized with the basic concepts so as to lay the foundation for the study of this subject, both in the theoretical and practical aspects. To achieve this purpose, discourse of western theories about basic issues central to the discipline of translation should be carefully selected and explained to the students, eg. translatability and notions of translation.

(1) Translatability

Students often have the misconception that everything is translatable as long as they have bilingual dictionaries in hand. This is grounded in their learning habits of the secondary school days. As language learners, they were always asked to find counterparts for English vocabularies in the Chinese language, and vice versa. They could easily do so with the help of bilingual dictionaries, for this was usually restricted to the level of isolated words. Students therefore come to believe that there is a counterpart for every word and consequently everything is translatable.

However, as students pursue the study of translation in tertiary institutions, and are asked, say for example, to translate the following simple folk rhyme, they would be disillusioned. This is because due to the phonological, lexical, linguistic and cultural differences between Chinese and English, there are so many features in the original which could not be retained.

好六叔，好六舅，
借我六斗六升好綠豆。
到了秋，收了豆，
再還六叔六舅六斗六升好綠豆。

Phonologically, '六斗' (six dou) and '綠豆' (green beans) are homonyms in Chinese. The recurring use of these two sounds, coupled with the repetition of the sound '六' (six)/ '綠' (green), altogether ten times, contribute to a smooth flow in the rhythm of the whole rhyme. Yet in the translation process, it is virtually impossible to find a pair of English homonyms to replace '六斗' and '綠豆', or an English word which has the same sound as '六' and '綠' at the same time.

Lexically, '六斗' (six dou) and '六升' (six sheng) are units of dry measure for grain used in China. To find a counterpart for this unique Chinese feature in English is asking for the impossible.

Linguistically, lines 1,2,4 and 5 all comprise three words. Such neatness in the structures of the lines, again, contributes to the harmonious quality of the rhyme, and is rather typical of Chinese rhymed verses. Nevertheless, in the translation process, this structural pattern could hardly be retained.

Culturally, '六叔' (sixth paternal uncle) and '六舅' (sixth

maternal uncle) are kinship terms, so distinctly and accurately defined by the Chinese in the light of the extended family system that even the seniority of the uncle in the family is spelt out. Westerners, on the other hand, more accustomed to the nucleus family system, are less compartmentalized in the use of such kinship terms. The difference in social culture between the Chinese and westerners, as manifested in this instance in the family system, hence renders translation difficult.

The complexity of the question of translatability and untranslatability is overwhelming to the students. An introduction of how the question has been reflected upon by western theorists would be of tremendous help.

In fact, the issue of translatability has a long history which could be dated back to the Romantic period. It gained prominence in the nineteenth century with discussions centred on text translatability, partial translatability and untranslatability. (Wilss: 1982: 28-9) Bassnett-McGuire has given an account of the views of different people, from Catford, Popovic to Mounin. (Bassnett-McGuire: 1985: 32-7) Van den Broeck is right in pointing out that the question of (un)translatability has constituted a topic of great interest. He has further recorded how the question of (un)translatability has been looked at from different angles by the linguists, philosophers and psychoanalyst. (Van den Broeck: 1992:115-9) An introduction of these views would undoubtedly help students to understand this issue basic to the discipline of translation.

(2) Notions of translation

Books on translation theories and principles are interspersed with notions pertaining to translation --- its nature, types, etc.

First, the notion of what translation is about. This has been defined differently. There are theorists such as Savory who has chosen to see translation as an art, or Jacobsen who has chosen to see it as a craft, while others might take it as science. (Bassnett-McGuire: 1985: 4) Newmark has endeavoured to draw the line of distinction between translation as an art and science. (Newmark: 1984: 136-7) Gutt has observed the contradictory views that on the one hand, translation defies scientific investigation because it is an art; and on the other, due to the poor scientific understanding of translation, it has not been studied in a proper scientific manner. (Gutt: 1991: 2)

Second, in regard to types of translation, it is by and large categorized into word-for-word, literal and free translation. Actually, different kinds of classifications have been made throughout the long period of western translation history. As early as in the days of the Roman Empire, Cicero has distinguished between word for word translation and sense for sense translation. Dryden has divided translation into the three types of metaphrase, paraphrase and imitation. Humphrey has

categorized translation into three modes, i.e. literalism, free or licentious adaptation, and the just via media. (Steiner: 1976: 236,253-4,263) In the twentieth century, Catford has classified translation into two types: rank-bound and unbounded. (Catford: 1965: 25) Newmark has made distinction between semantic and communicative translation. (Newmark:1984: 38-56, 62-9)

It is of immense importance to acquaint students with these as exposure to diversified views of theorists would help students gain insight into the intriguing world of translation.

Elucidation

With the laying of the foundation, interesting and thought-provoking ideas of individual theorists could further be introduced to the students. This requires elucidation. For every idea introduced, care must be taken to explain it adequately so as to ensure a correct and full understanding. Nida's dynamic equivalence and Newmark's semantic and communicative translation are quoted as examples.

(1) Nida's dynamic equivalence

The essence of this theory lies in that the receptors should respond to the message in the receptor language in more or less the same manner as the receptors in the source language do. (Nida:1969:24) Nida's theory of equivalence has been highly valued by people who deal with translation between Chinese and English. There is a whole Chinese volume introducing his theories, mainly adapted and translated from his book The Theory and Practice of Translation, and with reference made to his other works as well. (Tan: 1984) Certainly, Nida is quite right in pointing out the importance of taking into account the receptors' response to the translated message. Yet the equivalence in response he proposes could only be achieved when it is clearly known who the receptors are. For Nida himself, he knows very well who his targeted receptors of the New Testament are, namely, the man in the street as well as the man in the congregation. (Nida:1964:170) This naturally enables him to work out a translation which could produce an equivalent response. However, for translation work in general, there are occasions when the targeted receptors of the translated text is not defined. Under such circumstances this theory could not be brought into play. So when this theory is introduced to students, its function has to be correctly and clearly elucidated, and its limitation has to be pointed out. Though Nida himself claims that the scope of his translation theory is all-inclusive, (Nida: 1964:ix) students have to be warned that they should not think that it can be universally applied to all situations, irrespective of the types of translation involved. Indeed, Delisle is right in suggesting that 'The Theory and Practice of Bible Translation' could more aptly describe Nida's works. (Logan & Creery: 1980 :39)

(2) Newmark's semantic and communicative translation

Newmark has categorized translation into two types i.e. semantic and communicative translation. Semantic translation attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original, while communicative translation attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that on the readers of the original. He has quoted examples to illustrate the use of these two kinds of translation. (Newmark: 1984: 39 & 54) But because the source language of his examples given is often European languages, Hong Kong students are not able to truly understand the vital differences between these two kinds of translations.

As a result, when Newmark's theory is introduced, it has to be fully elucidated with the help of examples using the Chinese and English language so as to reinforce the students' understanding. Newmark has given the two examples of 'Bissiger Hund' and 'Frisch angestrichen!' and explained that if these are semantically translated into 'Biting dog!' and 'Recently painted!', the target readers would not understand these. Therefore communicative translation should be used to render these into English, hence 'Beware of the dog!' and 'Wet paint!'. The same kind of differentiation must also be made and elucidated clearly to Hong Kong students. Take the two expressions quoted as examples. If they are semantically translated into Chinese as '小心狗隻' and '濕油' respectively, they would sound very odd to target readers, whereas the communicative translation of '內有惡犬' and '油漆未乾' would be more natural and idiomatic.

Newmark has remarked that communicative translation is applied to the great majority of texts, among which is non-personal correspondence, (Newmark: 1984: 44) but he has not elaborated on this. Since this is also a valid observation when applied to translation between Chinese and English, it must be ensured that examples are quoted to bring this home to the students. The striking difference in the opening and ending of Chinese and English official letters should be highlighted. English letters begin with the standard phrase of 'Dear Sir' or 'Dear Mr so-and-so' and end with the standard phrase 'Yours faithfully' or 'Yours sincerely'. These sound very natural to English readers. But if these are semantically translated into '親愛的先生' or '親愛的某先生' and '你最忠誠的' or '你真摯的' respectively, these would be jarring to the target readers. Obviously semantic translation is definitely out of place here, as the effect it produces on the original and target readers is markedly different.

Consideration should instead be given to how target readers would begin and end their letters. For the opening, they would simply write '某先生' (Mr so-and-so) in a matter-of-fact manner, without any emotive sense as contained in the word of 'Dear'. As for the ending, they do not have an expression which corresponds to that of 'Yours faithfully' or 'Yours sincerely' in function. And it is this Chinese way of opening and ending a letter which students should take into full account and use in

translating English letters, for the sake of producing on the target readers an effect as close as possible to that on the original readers.

Adaptation

There are instances when views of western theorists, though well worth noting, does not have obvious relevance or direct applicability to translation between Chinese and English. Under such circumstances, adaptation could be a useful bridging device to turn what seems irrelevant and pointless to something relevant and enlightening. The following two cases of Finlay's faux amis and Catford's category shifts show how adaptation could be made.

(1) Finlay's faux amis (false friends)

Finlay has cautioned translators to be careful about certain words in the European languages which, despite their resemblance in appearance to words of other languages, have entirely different meanings. This is what is meant by faux amis. He has quoted a series of examples for illustration, for example, the Dutch word 'vertragen' means to slow down while the same word in German means to endure and bear; the German word 'also' means 'therefore' and by no means shares the meaning of the English word 'also'. (Finlay: 1971: 112-4)

Hong Kong students are in no danger of falling into the traps of the faux amis quoted by Finlay since in the first place they do not know any European languages. Nevertheless, it must be made known to them that such faux amis also exist in the Oriental languages, namely in the Chinese and Japanese languages. The wordings are identical, but the meanings in the two languages greatly differ. For example, the expression '真面目' means 'the true features, true look' in Chinese, whereas in Japanese it means 'serious' (majime); the expression '丈夫' means 'husband' in Chinese, whereas in Japanese it means 'sturdy, firm' (jōbu); the expression '留守' means 'stay and guard' in Chinese, whereas in Japanese it means 'absence, away from home' (rusu). Students have to be cautioned that whenever they have to tackle a text which contains or refers to expressions as used by the Japanese, they must be particularly on the alert and take extra care to look up the real meanings of the expressions.

Apart from this parallel between the European and Oriental languages with regard to the existence of the faux amis, this principle could, moreover, be adapted to serve a new purpose in translation between Chinese and English. Faux amis, basically, refers to the same word which has different meanings in different European languages. In Chinese, the reverse may sometimes hold true. There are cases when the same thing may be expressed in totally different and unrelated wordings according to the use in different places. The main concern here is directed at the use of Chinese in Hong Kong and Mainland China.

It is not difficult to substantiate the view that Chinese, as used in Hong Kong, differs from that used in China in the use of certain vocabularies. There are plenty of examples. For instance, the simple English word 'policeman' has different renditions in Hong Kong and China. The former will call these people '警察', while the latter will address them as '公安'. A similar case could be found in the translation of the English word 'tomato'. In Hong Kong the object is called '番茄' whereas in China it is known as '西紅柿'. What women in Hong Kong call as '唇膏' (lipstick) is known as '口紅' in China. These are examples showing how two different expressions in Chinese could actually be referring to the same thing. They could in fact be considered as non-identical twins. Students must be taught to note the existence of such twins in the Chinese language as used in Hong Kong and China. They must also be aware of the problem of the targeted readership, say in Hong Kong or China, because it is only with a precise knowledge of this that they are able to make the correct choice of words in their translated text.

(2) Catford's category shifts

Catford primarily looks at translation from a linguistic point of view. Having established that there are five units on the rank scale in English grammar --- sentence, clause, group, word, morpheme, he postulates category shifts in great detail. (Catford: 1965: 8,75-82)

As the Chinese language has a different syntactic structure, and consequently does not tally with his five units on the rank scale, again adaptation has to be made. For example, the structure of relative clauses, which is one prominent feature of the English language introduced by relative pronouns such as 'who', 'which', 'whom', are absent in the Chinese language. So what Catford advocates could not be adopted by wholesale. Still, part of it could be adapted and applied to translation between Chinese and English. The following endeavours to show how the Chinese language copes with situations in which there are no counterparts for the English structures.

Going back to the use of the relative clause in the English language, it is helpful to quote an example.

'The company, which has just signed an agreement with the consortium, is going to set up a number of branch offices.'

It is obvious that the 'which' clause here is an adjectival clause. Due to the lack of a similar structure in the Chinese language, most students tend to put the meaning of the 'which' clause before the subject in Chinese, hence the translation reads as '剛跟財團簽訂合約的公司, 正要成立多間分行'. But with such a lengthy subject, this sentence sounds clumsy. To maintain smoothness in the translation, the 'which' clause itself could be translated into an independent and complete Chinese sentence and the whole translation would read as: '公司剛跟財團簽訂合約, 正要成立多間分行'.

Another structure which is commonly used in the English language but conspicuously absent in the Chinese language is prepositional phrases, eg.

'With the opening of the clinic by the charity organisation, the medical services in this district has been improved.'

The prepositional phrase here has similarly to be turned into a complete sentence, if the translation is to read smoothly. Hence, '慈善機構開設診所後，本區的醫療服務得以改善'.

In short, it is true that structures such as relative clause and prepositional phrases do not exist in the Chinese language, and this defies Catford's classification of the five units. Yet his concept of category shifts could still be adapted and applied in great flexibility to serve a new purpose in translation between Chinese and English.

Supplementation

Where a certain point is concerned, western theories and principles could at times be applied wholly and directly to translation between Chinese and English. But because of the uniqueness of the Chinese language, those theories and principles may not suffice to cover all that are essential. In this case, supplementation has to be made. The techniques of transliteration and translation of figures of speech are quoted here as examples. There is still another area which requires supplementation. This refers to cases where a concept or term which has a 'foreign' origin has been borrowed into the Chinese translation circle and bandied about. Supplementary information on how the concept or term has been used in the place of its origin has to be provided to students so that they could have enough data to make well-informed judgement. The concept of equivalence is a case in point here.

(1) Techniques of transliteration and translation of figures of speech

Transliteration

Catford has outlined the processes of transliteration (Catford: 1965: 66) which could duly be applied to translation between Chinese and English. The name of the former American President, Carter, could be used for illustration. The first step Catford proposes is to replace the SL (source language) letters by SL phonological units. In the case of the name 'Carter', it is represented by the phonetic symbols of 'ka: tə'. The second step is to translate the SL phonological units into TL (target language) phonological units. The phonetic symbols of 'ka: tə' here could be matched by the Chinese phonetic alphabets of 'ka te'. The third step, then, is to convert the TL phonological units into TL graphological units. 'ka te' could hence be converted into '卡特'. And this is how Carter is known to people in Mainland China and Hong Kong.

However, attention must be drawn to the fact that despite its relevance, Catford's transliteration system is by no means the one and only method used. People in Mainland China tend to adopt this method. But in Hong Kong, the whole point of transliteration must be looked at from a local point of view.

Instances abound whereby names of expatriate civil servants in Hong Kong are not transliterated in accordance with Catford's system. Instead, their translated names, in ten cases out of ten, do not sound at all like their original English names. Their names are represented by three Chinese characters, usually with auspicious meaning, just like those of most Chinese people. For example, one could not see close phonological resemblance between the original name of the present governor of Hong Kong, Chris Patten, and his Chinese name '彭定康' (peng ding kang), but one could readily detect the sense of auspiciousness, '定' meaning 'stability' and '康' 'well-being'. Localized cases like these must be highlighted to students as supplementary information when the point of transliteration is dwelt upon, because apart from relevant theories, it is equally important for them to know how this is put into actual practice in Hong Kong where auspiciousness of the characters chosen invariably takes precedence over phonological approximation.

There is, still, one more point which must be stressed to students for supplementation. Students must be cautious of the romanized names of Koreans and Japanese. They would err if they follow either Catford's transliteration system or the practice prevalent in Hong Kong's civil service. They should learn that both Koreans and Japanese use Chinese characters too and every romanized name has corresponding prescribed Chinese characters. For example, the romanized name of Kim Il Sung, the deceased ruler of North Korea, should be correctly presented by the Chinese characters of '金日成', and the name of Murayama Tomiichi, the present Japanese prime minister, should be presented as '村山富市'. To avoid any great mistake, students should be advised to take heed of these and make use of relevant biographical dictionaries.

Translation of figures of speech

Newmark has devoted one whole chapter to discussing the translation of metaphors, a type of figure of speech. He has put forward a number of translation procedures: reproducing the same image in the TL (target language); replacing the image in the SL (source language) with a standard TL image; translation of metaphor by simile; translation of metaphor (or simile) by simile plus sense; conversion of metaphor to sense; deletion; same metaphor combined with sense. (Newmark: 1984: 84-96)

Nida has slightly touched on the translation of figurative expressions. He has propounded three ways with which figurative expressions could be transferred: shifts from figurative to nonfigurative usage; shifts from one type of figurative expression to another figurative expression; nonfigurative expressions changed to figurative ones. (Nida: 1969: 107)

These come in useful for translation between Chinese and English as well since both languages are rich in such kinds of expressions. It must, moreover, be underlined that in Chinese, there is an additional type of figures of speech unique to itself, which merits students' attention when this point is tackled. This is the use of 'xiehouyu' (歇後語).

'Xiehouyu' is composed of two parts. The first part, clearly stated, is descriptive; the second part, mostly unstated, conveys the actual meaning. In fact, it is a common practice that only the first part is stated when 'xiehouyu' is used, as the second part will be understood without ado.

However, difficulty arises when this has to be translated. To use any one of the translation methods proposed by Newmark or Nida as described earlier on is inadequate because this will mean that only the first part is translated or the sense of the first part is tackled. But the key meaning implicit in the second part, which is not stated, will be omitted, and this fails to capture the essence of the 'xiehouyu'. For the benefit of the target language readers, both parts should be translated. For example, when the 'xiehouyu' '泥菩薩過江' is translated as 'the clay idol fords the river', target readers will not be able to grasp its implicit meaning, so the implicit meaning of '自身難保' i.e. 'hardly able to protect oneself, let alone helping other people' must be included in the translation. Also when another example '啞子吃黃蓮' ('the dumb person tastes the bitter herbs') is translated, the implicit meaning of the second part '有苦自己知' ('unable to give vent to one's bitter feelings') should be rendered as well. Thus in translating xiehouyu, extra attention is required to probe into the implicit meaning contained in the second part and convey it in explicit terms in the target language too. This is quite unlike the translation methods proposed by both Newmark or Nida in tackling figures of speech, and should be pointed out to students as supplementation.

(2) Concept of equivalence

This concept, first propounded by western theorists, has constituted the main concern of people dealing with translation between Chinese and English. When Wilss' book The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods, was translated into Chinese, only the first seven chapters were included for these are considered to be more important. The last chapter included is on 'Translation Equivalence'. (Zhu & Zhou: 1989) In the postscript of their book Explorations in Equal Value Translation published in 1990, the authors wrote that the representative works of overseas contemporary translation theories include Catford's A Linguistics Theory of Translation and Nida's Towards a Science of Translation. (Wu & Li: 1990) In their book which revolves around the topic of equal value and equivalence, they have attempted to discuss translation between Chinese and English on the basis of the concept of equivalence, which they have borrowed from the western world.

In recent years, the concept of equivalence has been in vogue among Chinese translation theorists. As translation between Chinese and English is practised in Hong Kong, it is worthwhile presenting students with the picture of the translation world of contemporary China. Yet it is equally important to scrutinize how the concept of equivalence, accorded with such great importance by Chinese translators, is treated by their western counterparts. To strike a balanced view, students should be briefed on the updated account of what happens in the west so that they could be in a better position to make comparison and judgement.

In fact, so far as the concept of equivalence is concerned, the western translation world is rife with contradictory views. This concept is actually not a newly evolved issue but one which has a long history of 2000 years, as pointed out by Wilss. (Wilss: 1982: 134) Yet debates over its definition and function are still ongoing.

Svejcer has recognised that equivalence is a key issue in translation theory, but this is an issue with which linguists seem to have agreed to disagree. (Svejcer:1981: 321)

Wilss has remarked that no other concepts in translation theory has produced as many contradictory views as the concept of translation equivalence, and led to as many attempts to arrive at a comprehensive definition as this concept. (Wilss: 1982: 134)

Snell-Hornby has attempted to distinguish between 'equivalence' and 'Gleichwertigkeit', and further stated that equivalence, at most, exists at the level of terminology and nomenclature. (Snell-Hornby: 1988:17-8,106)

Pöchhacker has summed up the various views put forward by different people and arrived at the conclusion that this concept of equivalence is vague and poorly defined. (Pöchhacker: 1989: 566)

Gutt has summarized the different frames of reference proposed by different people: Kade's approach at the content level, Koller's 'textual effect', Nida and Taber's 'audience response', and Koller's five frames of reference of denotation, connotation, textual norms, pragmatics and form. (Gutt: 1991: 10)

Hewson and Martin have commented that this concept is basically fuzzy, which contributes to an unclear understanding of Nida's dynamic and formal equivalences. (Hewson & Martin: 1991: 21)

Baker has divided her book into different chapters, each on a particular type of equivalence --- equivalence at word level, equivalence above word level, grammatical equivalence, textual equivalence, pragmatic equivalence, but she has also stated explicitly in the introduction that the term of equivalence is used for the sake of convenience and it does not have any theoretical status. She is, moreover, of the opinion that

equivalence could be achieved to a certain extent, but it can be influenced by linguistic or cultural factors. (Baker: 1992: 5-6)

Pym has come up with a new interpretation for this concept. He has taken equivalence as an economic term and hence defined it in terms of exchange value. Equivalence is expressed as relationship between texts which will be determined by the translator who is compared to a silent trader. (Pym: 1992: 44,46)

As the above account shows, the definition for equivalence is still now a bone of contention in the western translation world. As a result, this concept is clouded by these highly controversial views. Students should be updated with the latest development of this concept in the west, especially in the light of the fact that this concept is attached with such great significance by contemporary Chinese theorists.

Conclusion

With its long history, western theories and principles serve as an invaluable wealth of materials for study and research. But it must be noted that they are not all directly applicable to translation between Chinese and English. Nor are they comprehensive enough to embrace everything that is essential when translation between Chinese and English is of the main concern. All 'foreign translation theories', if put to 'domestic' use, call for special and meticulously designed treatment. However, the pedagogy of teaching of translation in this area is seriously underresearched. The theoretical framework of S.E.A.S., that is, selection, elucidation, adaptation and supplementation, put forward in this paper may serve as an experimental basis for translation teaching and related research.

References

- Baker, Mona. (1992) In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. London: Routledge.
- Bassnett-McGuire, Susan. (1985) Translation Studies. London: Methuen.
- van den Broeck, Raymond. (1992) Translation Theory Revisited. Target 4:1. 111-20.
- Catford, J.C. (1965) A Linguistic Theory of Translation. London: O.U.P.
- Finlay, Ian F. (1971) Translating. London: English Universities Press.
- Gutt, Ernst-August. (1991) Translation and

Relevance. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hewson, Lance & Jacky Martin. (1991) Redefining Translation: The Variational Approach. London: Routledge.

Logan, Patricia & Monica Creery. (1980) Translation: An Interpretive Approach. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press. (This volume is a translation of Part I of Jean Delisle's book L'analyse du discours comme méthode de traduction: Initiation à la traduction française de textes pragmatiques anglais, théorie et pratique).

Newmark, Peter. (1984) Approaches to Translation. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Nida, Eugene A. (1964) Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: Brill.

Nida, Eugene A. & Charles R. Taber. (1969) The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: Brill.

Pöchhacker, Franz. (1989) Beyond Equivalence: Recent Developments in Translation Theory. In Deanna Lindberg Hammond (ed.) Coming of Age: Proceedings of the 30th Annual Conference of the American Translators Association, 563-71.

Pym, Anthony. (1992) Translation and Text Transfer: An Essay on the Principles of Intercultural Communication. Frankfurt am Main: Peterlang.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. (1988) Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Steiner, George. (1976) After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation. New York: Oxford University Press.

Svejcic, A.D. (1981) Levels of Equivalence or Translation Models? In W. Kuhlwein, G. Thome and W. Wilss (eds.) Kontrastive Linguistik und Übersetzungswissenschaft. Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums Trier/Saarbrücken, 25.-30.9.1978. München, 329-3.

Wilss, Wolfram. (1982) The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods. Tübingen: Narr.

譚載喜編譯 (1984) 奈達論翻譯北京:中國對外翻譯出版公司

祝珏、周智謨編譯 (1989) 翻譯學問題與方法北京:中國對外翻譯出版公司

吳新祥、李宏安 (1990) 等值翻譯論江西:江西教育出版社